



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Susan Kairalla

Amado Leon

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW First St., #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PLEASE
NOTE
LOCATION

SOUTH MIAMI LIBRARY
6000 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

PLEASE
NOTE
LOCATION

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2005
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF JANUARY 26, 2005
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. FDOT RRR PROGRAM – K. Jeffries, FDOT
 - B. FDOT PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECTS – K. Jeffries, FDOT
 - C. SOUTH MIAMI PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS – A. Smith, MDT
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. MDTV INTERACTIVE BPAC/CTAC/TARC MEETING – D. Henderson
 - B. BRICKELL AV. SIDEWALK ORDINANCE – D. Henderson
 - C. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. CORAL GABLES BIKE LANE MASTER PLAN – D. Henderson
 - B. JANUARY REPORT – J. Manzella
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

PLEASE
NOTE
LOCATION

SOUTH MIAMI LIBRARY
6000 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

PLEASE
NOTE
LOCATION

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sheila Boyce
Amado Leon

Brett Bibeau
Ted Silver

Barry Burak
Susan Kairalla

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff Jeff Cohen, Public Works Ken Jeffries, FDOT Amy Wang, FDOT
Lew Sayre, FDOT Isabel Padron, MDT Anthony Smith, MDT Julio Boucle, URS Corp.
William Brown, PBS&J Glenn Myers, PBS&J Claudia Schmid, Cyclist Eric Tullberg, Cyclist
Louis Foster, Off-Road Enthusiast Noel Cleland, Commuter Cyclist

The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SB: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of January 26, 2005; seconded by SK; vote – unanimous.</i>
FDOT RRR PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS	- KJ: The FDOT has identified roadways they plan to resurface over the next few years. This list is slightly different than what DH passed-out at the last BPAC meeting. Because of the BPAC's recent Resolution regarding resurfacing projects, FDOT staff made another review of the projects to determine possible candidates for bike lanes or wide paved shoulders. Some projects are already designed or at the 90% stage; others are along heavy truck routes, where the FDOT would not encourage cyclists to travel. Along Normandy Dr., automobile parking can be removed to incorporate a bicycle facility. Bird Rd. has potential; available right-of-way is being reviewed; however, trees in the medians cannot be removed. Galloway Rd. is another candidate. There wasn't enough time before this meeting to perform all the reviews. DH: Regarding Sunny Isles Blvd., only a small portion of that project is funded through the grant identified. This corridor is used by cyclists traveling to Oleta State Pk., etc. The City of North Miami Beach is interested in connecting this with their future bikeways. TS: Inquired about the NW area around Okeechobee Rd. KJ: There is heavy truck volume in these areas. BBibeau: Since SW 1 St. is multi-laned, space should be made to accommodate bicycles across the bridge; instead of the "could be" accommodated notation. TS: Although some of the short-length projects weren't reviewed for bicycle accommodations, FDOT staff should ensure that these corridors do not connect to future plans for bikeways. Including a bikeway may sway future construction designs to continue the same accommodations. KJ: Some FDOT districts do design short segments with bikeways with that intention. TS: The ability to access these bikeways from the adjoining areas has to be considered. SB: Considers Bird Rd. a logical candidate, since it is a widely-used east-west corridor. JC: NW 72 Av. is in the N-Dade Greenways Plan, as well as a future NW 25 St. bridge. TS: FDOT staff should consider bike lanes in all their projects. Even if there is enough ROW for a separate path, the safety of getting on/off of that facility has to be determined. SB: If there isn't enough room for bike lanes, substitute them for paved shoulders. It is the line that separates automobiles and bicycles that is important. TS: High-commercial areas have to be made a higher priority to accommodate cyclists. JC: Industrial sections should also be a priority. The FDOT aversion to accommodate

	<p>cyclists in heavy truck traffic areas seems counterintuitive.</p> <p>KJ: These projects have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>TS: Attempting to provide safe space on Okeechobee Rd. would benefit those cyclists traveling to many of the commercial places in the area. While not advocating bike lanes to attract more cyclists, we have to acknowledge existing needs. Even two feet helps; if it is available, it should be done. Do not disqualify bikeways simply because of heavy truck volumes. There is an inconsistency for whom the FDOT is including within their designs. The BPAC reviews these projects for all cyclists, not just recreational travel.</p> <p>JB: There are other factors that have to be in place as well.</p> <p>JC: Questioned why bike lanes could not be installed along Bird Rd. if sidewalks were not installed, (as described in the list), instead of the wider outside lanes. This corridor serves several destinations for cyclists: schools, shops, etc.; and is already widely cycled.</p> <p>DH: Inquired when the last field reviews would be done; and asked to be kept informed.</p> <p>KJ: <i>These should be finished around May.</i></p> <p>NC: He uses NW 72 Av. every day. Only 2 blocks have decent separation between trucks and where he rides. He is very appreciative of these 2 blocks.</p>
FDOT SAFETY PROJECTS	<p>- KJ: (Passed-out a synopsis of the consultants' recommendations.) None of the projects are in design yet. <i>The 1st five projects will be contracted-out within a year.</i></p> <p>DH: Within the limits of all the listed corridors are high vehicle/pedestrian crash zones.</p> <p>BBibeau: Assumes the NW 12 Av. corridor depicted would have a design already, as part of the larger 12 Av. bridge project.</p> <p>JB: These are spot improvement projects.</p> <p>SB: The FDOT should be lauded for taking on this pedestrian project.</p> <p>KJ: The FDOT Safety office is providing the funding.</p> <p>SK: Educational efforts should be done to bring Miami-Dade motorists a better understanding of what their responsibilities are at crosswalks.</p> <p>KJ: The DMV literature covers this topic for people applying for driver licenses. The FDOT has limited funding for education.</p> <p>CS: Any type of education also needs an enforcement component.</p> <p>BBibeau: Most traffic signals have signs to educate pedestrians how to proceed when they push the activator. The new countdown signals are beneficial as well.</p> <p>TS: Looks forward to working more closely with the FDOT on this project.</p>
SOUTH MIAMI PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS	<p>- GM: This project has been under design for 6 years; originally by City of South Miami staff, now being pursued by MDT. Pedestrian crossing US-1 to/from S. Miami Metrorail station is daunting. There was a public workshop several years ago; and 3 alternatives have been developed. The cost estimates and functionalities are still under review. Alternative A: crosses over the station platform, ending near the parking garage and the corner of US-1/Sunset Dr. FDOT is favorable to the design variance it would require. Alt. B: crosses over the station canopy further to the north. This design is closest to the workshop recommendations. It too requires an FDOT design variance. Alt. C: crosses over the station, even further north, leading pedestrians to SW 71 St., which connects to the Sunset Place parking garage. This design doesn't require a variance.</p> <p>WB: Alt. A has space constraints on both sides of US-1. Going over the tracks requires significant heights for the elevator/stair towers. The City would like to save the existing building on the NE corner, so it has been incorporated into the design. Alt. B doesn't affect any existing buildings. This design is even higher than Alt. A. Alt. C impacts the fire station parking lot, as well as requires demolishing the existing building on the east.</p>

	<p>TS: Alt. A allows those leaving the overpass to avoid foul weather; the others do not.</p> <p>WB: Agrees. The study group is considering another design alternative for the towers in order to reduce the space limitations at the corner of US-1.</p> <p>CS: It would be beneficial if the overpass allowed access to the platform.</p> <p>WB: This was an original concept; however, security concerns and space required for fare collection has negated this design.</p> <p>TS: Inquired about the connection from the parking garage to the overpass.</p> <p>WB: There isn't a direct connection, it requires people to access it from the ground.</p> <p>TS: There should be a direct connection.</p> <p>WB: It may be possible to extend the overpass from the tower to the top of the garage.</p> <p>TS: It has to be easy or else people won't use it.</p> <p>BB: Inquired about the impact to the existing bike parking.</p> <p>WB: Alt. A requires some lockers to be relocated.</p> <p>BB: Suggested talking with the Douglas Rd. overpass consultants regarding considerations they may have/or would have made, now that it is complete. Inquired if bikes would fit into the elevators.</p> <p>WB: Yes, the elevators are large enough accommodate a large group of pedestrians.</p> <p>TS: Requested any literature developed to include the words: bicycle, bicyclists.</p> <p>DH: Inquired if no-build alternatives were developed, such as: ITS, high-profile lighting, lit crosswalks, etc. These would be less expensive, and the cost savings could provide similar treatments at SW 70 St, where there is a significant amount of pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>WB: No-build was not a part of the scope, although the study team did consider some.</p> <p>TS: A direct connection to the Sunset Place garage would be a great advantage.</p> <p>WB: That proposal is beyond the scope of the study.</p> <p>AW: Inquired if any counts have been done regarding use of existing overpasses.</p> <p>WB: People aren't forced to use them. The cost benefits are a concern. Unofficially, the S. Miami overpass will cost between \$5-6 million. About ¼ of this is land acquisition.</p> <p>SK: Without direct connections to the Metrorail station and garage, the overpass will not be used as often as preferred; and it will not promote Metrorail use.</p> <p>TS: Going up and down in these towers requires more time than crossing at ground level.</p> <p>SK: Perhaps a design could be made to accommodate only those departing from Metrorail to access the overpass.</p> <p>TS: In an attempt to keep costs down, eliminating a direct connection to the garage will likely eliminate much of the overpass' potential users.</p> <p>GM: A design from the original consultant had this feature as a second phase.</p> <p>ET: Inquired if a tunnel was considered.</p> <p>GM: Costs would be exorbitant, considering the utilities underground and the coral base.</p>
M-D PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE	<p>- JC: When he redesigned the Rickenbacker Cswy. years ago, many plan pages referred to contacting him regarding portions of construction. New guidelines from the funding agency require all these details to be printed out. He is in the process of do so.</p> <p>BBibeau: Inquired about the timeline of the project.</p> <p>JC: By the time a timeline is prepared, the actual timeline will shift, due to new developments. It would be hard to develop a timeline, due to uncertainties.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if a projected expectation of start/finish could be made.</p> <p>JC: There are too many uncertainties.</p> <p>BBurak: All the excuses that have been made for this project indicate the Public Works Dept. is incompetent when it comes to bicycle facility construction.</p> <p>JC: The "fast-track" process requires a greater level of detail.</p>

	<p>TS: There is a resistance against a proposed SW 97 Av. bridge at C-100 Canal. Inquired if this would affect bicycle mobility in any way.</p> <p>JC: There are no bicycle accommodations planned for this bridge. The developer has proposed this bridge to connect to his (proposed) subdivision, as a private roadway. M-DPW prefers to have SW 97 Av. connect 152 St. to 163 St. There are few avenues that provide connections in this area, due to canals and expressways.</p>
INTERACTIVE TIP MEETING	<p>- TS: <i>In replace of the March BPAC meeting, he will be participating in this annual event, along with the Chairs of CTAC & TARC. It will be at 5:30 pm in Downtown Miami.</i></p>
BRICKELL AV. SIDEWALK ORDINANCE	<p>- DH: He had contacted the Miami Mayor's Office; they said the Brickell Homeowners Assoc. has been complaining about bicycle riders on the path for a long time. It seems that the City does not favor the restriction. They welcome those groups pointing-out that this is a historic bike route. A date for this issue has not been set.</p> <p>TS: Trusts that DH & JC will keep tract of any developments, as well as timely notify him if this issue escalates to critical status.</p> <p>JC: This issue is being discussed at the County & City Managers' level. It may be solved before a public hearing. Inquired if there was a general consensus from the group.</p> <p>TS: The issue hasn't formally been discussed. The BPAC favors the current route system. It could be revisited. The City should have asked for BPAC review.</p>

- *The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m.*